

### **REMARKS**

The Office action mailed May 25, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully noted. The pending claims, claims 1-12, were rejected. By this Response, claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended, claims 8, 10, 11, and 12 are canceled and claim 13 is newly added. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims as amended are respectfully requested.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner deemed that:

1. The phrase “adapted to bend and stretch” renders claims 1 and 6 indefinite as they provide no structural recitation but merely desired results;
2. The word “main” in line 11 of claim 1 and line 5 of claim 2 should be “base”;
3. Claim 8 is improper as it contradicts claim 6; and
4. Claim 10 is indefinite since it fails to correlate the intermediate main arms together and to correlate the intermediate auxiliary arms together.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims, as amended, are clear and definite and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should properly be withdrawn.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese reference 62-106168.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the claimed invention, an auxiliary arm mechanism (22) includes not only an arm linkage (32), but also includes a base arm (30) having a proximal end supported by a base (16). On the other hand, in JP 62-106168, each arm mechanism (10 and 11) includes only an arm linkage (2, 3, 4, and 5). Thus, JP 62-106168 does not teach each and every limitation of the claimed invention. Specifically, JP 62-106168 does not teach an auxiliary arm mechanism having (a) an arm linkage and (b) a base arm (c) having a proximal end (d) supported by a base.

Therefore, the present invention as claimed is novel and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should properly be withdrawn.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

*Brogardh*

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brogardh.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the present invention as claimed, a pick (14A, 14B) and a main arm mechanism (20) move only in a first operating plane. On the other hand, in Brogardh, a working member (3q) and arm mechanisms (5q, 9q, 100, 17 q, and 21q) do not move only in a single common plane, but move in three dimensions. Since Brogardh does not teach that the pick and the main arm mechanism move *only* in the first operating plane, Brogardh does not anticipate the present invention.

Therefore, the claimed invention is novel and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should properly be withdrawn.

*Tsubota, et al.*

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsubota, et al. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the claimed invention does not require that the main arm mechanism be directly connected to the base, and that the auxiliary arm mechanism be directly connected to the pick.

Applicant respectfully submits that in the present invention, not only the auxiliary arm mechanism (base arm (3)), but also the main arm mechanism (20) has a proximal end supported by the base (16). On the other hand, in Tsubota, et al., a hand moving mechanism (3) has a proximal end not directly connected to a base (1), but connected to a distal end of a link mechanism (2). Consequently, in Tsubota, et al., the hands (30) and the main arm mechanism (20) do not move in a specific single plane according to the present invention.

Also, in Tsubota, et al., the link mechanism (2) distal end is not connected to the hands (3), but connected to the proximal end of the hand moving mechanism (3), thus movement of each hand (3) is not restricted within a radial direction above the center of a robot (R). In the

present invention, the main arm mechanism (20) and the auxiliary arm mechanism (arm linkage (32)) have distal ends connected to the pick (14A and 14B) such that movement of the pick is restricted within the radial direction about the center of an apparatus (12).

Since Tsubota, et al. do not teach (1) restricting the movement of the hands and the main arm mechanism in a single plane or (2) restricting the movement of the pick within the radial direction about the center of apparatus, Tsubota, et al. do not anticipate the present invention. Therefore, the claimed invention is novel and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) should properly be withdrawn.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese reference 62-106168 in view of Genov, et al. Specifically, the Examiner deemed that it would have been obvious to add links to the linkages in the Japanese reference to enhance the reach in view of the teaching in Genov, et al., at column 5, lines 16-20.

As amended herein, claims 10-12 have been canceled. Nevertheless, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining claims as amended are nonobvious over the prior art. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that JP 62-106168 does not teach or suggest an auxiliary arm mechanism having (a) an arm linkage and (b) a base arm (c) having a proximal end (d) supported by a base as claimed in the present invention. Genov, et al. do not alleviate the deficiencies of the Japanese reference. Nowhere do Genov, et al. teach or suggest adding a base arm having a proximal end supported by a base to the arm linkage. None of the cited prior art teaches or suggests the auxiliary arm mechanisms having a base arm having a proximal end supported by a base, as presently claimed.

Therefore, the present invention is nonobvious and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should properly be withdrawn.

### **Miscellaneous**

On June 8, 2005, Applicant's representative contacted the Examiner regarding the objection at paragraph 11 of the Office action. The Examiner indicated that paragraph 11 was an error and should be ignored. The Examiner indicated that claims 2 and 6-9 were free of the art

and would be allowable if claim 2 is amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

### **Request for Interview**

Applicant respectfully requests either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

### **CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300**, Attorney Docket No. **033082M198**.

Respectfully submitted,  
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch  
Registration No. 32,263

1850 M Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, DC 20036  
Tel.: (202) 263-4300  
Fax: (202) 263-4329

Date: September 23, 2005